



AF/1763
PATENT
Attorney Docket No.: 1084D01T9320
TTC No.: 016301-009320

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

In re application of:

DAVID CHEUNG et al.

Application No.: 09/418,818

Filed: October 15, 1999

For: METHOD AND APPARATUS
FOR DEPOSITING
ANTIREFLECTIVE COATING

Examiner: Rudy Zervigon

Art Unit: 1763

Confirmation No.: 9377

**APPELLANT'S REPLY BRIEF UNDER
37 CFR § 1.193(b)(1)**

Mail Stop Appeal Briefs - Patent
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Examiner's Answer mailed on July 2, 2004 to the Appeal Brief filed on April 5, 2004, Applicants respectfully request the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences to consider the following remarks. This reply brief is filed in triplicate, and is believed to be proper pursuant to 37 CFR § 1.193(b)(1).

ARGUMENTS:

1. On Pages 4-5 regarding the rejection of claims 1-6, 9, and 10, the Examiner states that Felts et al. (4,888,199) discloses a computer readable program and that Lee discloses "Applicant's claimed thickness as being an odd multiple, less than one, of the wavelength of light." **This statement is false.** The claim recites a thickness as being an odd multiple, greater than one, of a wavelength of light to be used in subsequent process operation on the layer.

On Page 5, the Examiner further states: "Applicant teaches on page 10 that said thickness is: $t = m\lambda/2n$." **This statement is also false.** The specification at page 10 discloses " $n_3 \cdot 2t = 1/2 (m\lambda)$." The expression for the thickness t based on this equation is $t = (m\lambda)/4n_3$.

On Page 5, the Examiner states: "Here, Forum [sic] Lee's factor of $m/2(n-1)$ - is the inverse of all odd numbers, for n as integer." **This statement is again erroneous.** The factor $m/2(n-1)$ cannot be the inverse of all odd numbers, since $2(n-1)$ must be an even number.

It is amply clear that the Examiner's rejection is based on a misinterpretation of the claimed invention, a misconstruction of the cited art, and erroneous mathematics.

2. On Page 6 regarding the rejection of claims 1-6, 9, and 10, the Examiner states: "In response, the Examiner sets forth that Forum [sic] Lee also teaches similar benefits for film thickness optimization . . . (column 3, lines 60-64; Figure 2)." While Lee mentions optimization of the thickness of the phase-shift layer 12, it does not disclose or suggest a thickness that is an odd multiple, greater than one, of a wavelength of light to be used in a subsequent process on the layer, and does not mention any of the advantages cited by the Applicants.
3. On page 7 regarding the rejection of claims 1-6, 9, and 10, the Examiner states: "In response, the Examiner cites Forum [sic] Lee again who teaches benefits for film thickness optimization." Again, although Lee mentions optimization of the thickness of the phase-shift layer 12, it does not disclose or suggest a thickness that is an odd multiple, greater than one, of a wavelength of light to be used in a subsequent process on the layer.
4. On pages 7-8 regarding the rejection of claim 51, the Examiner states: "In response, as the Examiner stated in the Final Rejection page 8: Felts et al

(USPat.5,364,665) teaches:" Nonetheless, "Felts et al. '665 does not cure the deficiencies of the other references," namely, Felts et al. '199, Batey et al., and Lee, as stated at page 14, lines 6-7 of Appellant's Brief.

5. On pages 8-9 regarding the rejection of claim 52, the Examiner states: "In response, as the Examiner stated in the Final Rejection page 8: Collins teaches" Nonetheless, "Collins et al. [] does not cure the deficiencies of the other references," namely, Felts et al. '199, Batey et al., and Lee, as stated at page 14, line 14 of Appellant's Brief.
6. On pages 9-11 regarding the rejection of claim 57, the Examiner states: "In response, the Examiner has conveyed: Batey teaches" It is clear, however, that Batey et al. does not teach or suggest depositing an antireflective layer to a thickness which is an odd multiple, greater than one, of a wavelength of light to be used in a subsequent process operation on the antireflective layer, as recited in claim 57.
7. On pages 11-12 regarding the rejection of claims 58 and 59, the Examiner states: "In response, the Examiner has asserted in the Final Action page 9 that Felts '199 teaches equivalent means . . . for delivering process gases . . . into the process chamber." Nonetheless, "[c]laims 58 and 59 are patentable for at least the same reasons that claim 57 is patentable." "Collins et al. [] does not cure the deficiencies of the other references." See page 16, lines 12-15 of Appellant's Brief.
8. On pages 12-16 regarding the rejection of claims 60, 61, and 62, the Examiner reiterated the assertions regarding the alleged teachings of Batey et al. and Lee. As discussed in Argument 1 above, however, **it is amply clear that the Examiner's rejection is based on a misinterpretation of the claimed invention, a misconstruction of the cited art, and erroneous mathematics.**

CONCLUSION:

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance, and respectfully request that the rejection of these claims be reversed.

Respectfully submitted,



Chun-Pok Leung
Reg. No. 41,405

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP

Tel: (415) 576-0200

Fax: (415) 576-0300

RL

60291164 v1



PTO/SB/21 (04-04)

**TRANSMITTAL
FORM**

(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)

Total Number of Pages in This Submission

13

Application Number

09/418,818

Filing Date

October 15, 1999

First Named Inventor

Cheung, David

Art Unit

1763

Examiner Name

Rudy Zervigon

Attorney Docket Number

016301-009320US

ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form | <input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s) | <input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance Communication to Technology Center (TC) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Fee Attached | <input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers | <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Amendment/Reply | <input type="checkbox"/> Petition | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) (in triplicate) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> After Final | <input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application | <input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s) | <input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address | <input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request | <input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below): |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request | <input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund | Two (2) Return Postcard |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement | <input type="checkbox"/> CD, Number of CD(s) _____ | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s) | Remarks | The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees to Deposit Account 20-1430.. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts/Incomplete Application | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53 | | |

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENTFirm
or
Individual name

Townsend and Townsend and Crew LLP

Chun-Pok Leung

Reg. No. 41,405

Signature

Date

September 2, 2004

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below.

Typed or printed name

Joy Salvador

Signature

Date

September 2, 2004